

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY -- PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

LAW OFFICES  
**AMIN, TUROCY AND CALVIN, LLP**  
24<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER  
1900 EAST NINTH STREET  
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114  
TELEPHONE: 216-696-8730  
FACSIMILE: 216-696-8731  
EMAIL: FDUNN@THEPATENTATTORNEYS.COM

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**FEB 12 2007**

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS LISTED BELOW VIA UNITED STATES MAIL. THANK YOU.

**DATE:** February 11, 2007  
**TO:** Jean B. Fleurantin - United States Patent and Trademark Office  
**EMAIL:** 571-273-4035  
**FROM:** Francis L. Dunn, Jr.  
**RE:** DRAFT - MEETING AGENDA

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Shrinivas Ashwin, *et al.*

Examiner: Jean B. Fleurantin

Serial No: 10/773,724

Art Unit: 2162

Filing Date: February 6, 2004

Title: ENHANCED TABULAR DATA STREAM PROTOCOL

NUMBER OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 1

*Received in cfc  
04-02-07  
FEB-11/07-SUN*

UNOFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FOR EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY - PLEASE DO NOT ENTER

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

To Examiner Fleurantin:

**FEB 12 2007**

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this matter at our appointment, scheduled February 12, 2007, at 2:00 p.m.

The issues I would like to get your input on to gain allowable subject matter regard:

- Review and clarification of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, including the Examiner's reasoning with regard to independent claims 1 and 23. In particular, the Examiner's reasoning behind the contention that Jordan, II, *et al.* (US 5,412,805) discloses "based at least in part on the number of pending requests known by the client device regardless of buffer size for the client device and the server device." (*See, e.g.,* Office Action dated January 4, 2007, p. 6.)
- Review and clarification of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101, including the Examiner's reasoning with regard to independent claim 11.
- Review and clarification of the Office Action Summary with regard to claims 14-22, 24, and 25. (*See, Office Action dated January 4, 2007.*)

If you have any other suggestions or ideas, I would be glad to discuss them as well. I look forward to speaking with you. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Francis L. Dunn, Jr.